IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 17866 of 2002

Between:

A. Srinkanth S/o late Sriramulu,
H. No. 18-3-724/A, J.P. Nagar, Chatrinaka, Hyderabad

(Minor rep by his mother and natural guardian B. Sunitha,

wife of late Sriramulu)

.... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Chatranaka Division, Chatrianaka, Hyderabad
2 The Inspector of Police
Chatrinaka Police Station, Hyderabad

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly a writ in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in opening a suspect sheet against the petitioner son and exhibiting his photographs in the office of the 1st and 2nd respondent as illegal and arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents herein to close the same and remove the photographs.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.A.RAVI SHANKAR

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: G.P. FOR HOME

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.17866 OF 2002

ORDER:

The petitioner, who is minor at the relevant time, filed present Writ Petition through his mother alleging that second respondent opened a suspect sheet displaying photograph in the Police Station though he is not involved in any crime. Therefore, he sought for a direction to close the same.

Second respondent filed a counter affidavit denying the allegations made in the affidavit accompanying the Writ Petition. The relevant averments in the counter affidavit are as follows.

> …It is submitted that it is true that against the son of the deponent of the affidavit, i.e., A.Srikanth, two crimes in Cr.No.210 and 211 of 2001, under Section 379 IPC were registered on the file of the 2nd respondent police station. It is also true that the same were ended in acquittal against him. However, it is not true to state that the photographs of the accused taken after the registration of the above crimes are being exhibited in the police station and in the office of the 1st respondent. It is false to allege that the police constables attached to the 2nd respondent police station are regularly

coming to the house of the deponent of the affidavit during odd hours to know the whereabouts of her son. The contention of the deponent of the affidavit that it appears that the police have opened a suspect sheet against her son, is not true and correct.

In view of the counter averments, it must be held that the Writ Petition is filed on mere apprehension. The Writ Petition is devoid of any merit and is accordingly dismissed.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

7.7.2005

bnr

To

1 The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Chatranaka Division, Chatrianaka, Hyderabad
2 The Inspector of Police
Chatrinaka Police Station, Hyderabad

3 2 CCs to G.P. for Home, High Court Bldgs., Hyderabad (OUT)

4 2 CD copies.